

## REMARKS

The claims were amended to address the Examiner's objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The amendment to line 18 of claim 11 was not made, as to do so would seem to imply that the same reverse acknowledgement channel was used as recited in claim 7, which may not be true in every instantiation of the embodiments of this invention.

It is noted that the Examiner objected to some of the claim language, and rejected certain claims based on similar language. It is submitted that the Examiner could have simply objected to all of this language. Thus, the foregoing amendments are not to be construed as amendments made for a reason related to patentability, and the full range of equivalents should remain in existence for all of the claims, as filed and as amended.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Linskog et al. (US 6,622,251 B1). This rejection is respectfully disagreed with, and is traversed below.

The inventors have reviewed Linskog et al., and note the following. Reference is made, for example, to the paragraph starting at col. 10, line 52, and in particular the text at col. 11, lines 1-7, where it is stated:

"Furthermore, in accordance with another embodiment of the invention, the sequence that an MT encounters can be alternately ascending and descending, to ensure that MTs having different MAC-IDs are treated fairly with respect to each other over time. For example, where an MT having a large value MAC-ID is near the end of the sequence a first time, it will be near the beginning of the sequence the next time."

Here the MAC\_ID is used to order the wake-up Packet Data Unit (PDU) in the Frame Control Channel (FCCH) and the Slow Broadcast Channel (SBCH) in two groups. However, MAC\_ID grouping is not disclosed by Linskog et al. to exist during the actual MAC\_ID assignment. This clearly differs from claim 1, that recites in part:

"wherein the **MAC\_ID is assigned in an ascending order** from the MAC\_ID

space for a first group of mobile stations, and wherein the **MAC\_ID is assigned in a descending order** from the MAC\_ID space for a second group of mobile stations" (emphasis added).

In that claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by Lindskog et al. then claims 2-4 are not rendered obvious or unpatentable over Lindskog et al. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejection of claims 1-4, and to allow claims 1-4 as filed.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Duncan Ho et al. (US 2003/0128683). This rejection is also respectfully disagreed with, and is traversed below.

In rejection the independent claims 5, 10, 11 and 13 the Examiner variously cites paragraphs [0009], [0012], [0013], [0038], [0057]-[0061] and [0062]-[0066]. It is noted that, for example, in paragraphs [0009], [0012] and [0057]-[0061] Ho et al. are addressing the generic behaviors of mobile stations and base stations when a forward packet data channel is in the control hold state, or during transition. That is, Ho et al. do not address the control hold state of the reverse packet data channel.

For example, paragraph [0009] recites in part:

"..an apparatus is presented for implementing an improved Control-Hold Mode within a remote station, wherein the remote station operates within a communication system that employs packet data channels with associated control channels, and associated feedback channels, the apparatus comprising: a memory element; and a processing element configured to execute a set of instructions stored in the memory element, the set of instructions for: ceasing the monitoring of packet data channels **from a base station**; ceasing the monitoring of control channels associated with the packet data channels **from the base station**; turning off a reverse link acknowledgment channel; gating off transmissions from the remote station to the base station; and intermittently transmitting over a data control channel" (emphasis added).

In contradistinction, claims 5-13 address the behaviors of mobile stations and base stations, including transition mechanisms, when reverse data channels are in a control hold state. This

S.N.: 10/817,214  
Art Unit: 2661

being the case, Ho et al. cannot anticipate the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejection of claims 5-13, and to allow these claims.


The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Lindskog et al. and Ho et al., and to allow all of the pending claims 1-13 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-13 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted:



Harry F. Smith

Reg. No.: 32,493



Date

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245  
email: hsmith@hspatent.com

S.N.: 10/817,214  
Art Unit: 2661



### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

12/16/2004

Date

Clarence F. Moran

Name of Person Making Deposit